Liberty on Trial: The Conundrum of Bail under the Prevention of Corruption Act

The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 ("**PC Act**") criminalizes bribery, abuse of official position, and possession of disproportionate assets by public servants. While the statute reflects a strong legislative intent to combat corruption, bail jurisprudence under the PC Act remains fundamentally anchored in Article 21 of the Constitution, which guarantees personal liberty and due process. Courts have consistently held that the PC Act does not create a separate or higher threshold for bail; rather, it operates within the general law governing arrest and bail, now substantially shaped by the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

I. Presumption of Innocence and the Rule of Bail

A central pillar of PC Act bail jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence until conviction. Allegations of corruption, however grave or politically sensitive, do not displace this presumption at the pre-trial stage. The Supreme Court has repeatedly reaffirmed the doctrine that **"bail is the rule and jail is the exception"**, emphasizing that pre-trial incarceration cannot be used as a measure of punishment or moral condemnation. This principle applies with full force to economic and corruption offences, subject only to well-defined risk considerations.

Summary Analysis of Key PC Act Bail Cases

Case (Court / Year)	Core Legal Principle Applied	Court's Legal Reasoning	Impact on Bail Jurisprudence
Sanjay Chandra v. CBI (2012) 1 SCC 40	Bail is the rule; jail the exception; gravity alone is not decisive.	The seriousness of an economic offence cannot, by itself, justify prolonged pre-trial	Established the foundation that economic or corruption offences do not create an automatic bar to bail, shaping all later PC Act bail analysis

		incarceration; risks. must be shown.	
Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51	Presumption of innocence; arrest is not mandatory; structured bail framework.	Arrest and custody must be based on necessity; cooperation and lack of arrest during investigation strongly favour bail.	Became the baseline authority for liberty-centric bail, now treated as the default standard in PC Act cases and reinforced under BNSS, 2023.
Mahipal v. Rajesh Kumar (2020) 2 SCC 118	Triple Test must be satisfied on material, not conjecture.	Risks of tampering or witness influence must be concrete and supported by evidence.	Prevented speculative denial of bail in corruption cases, especially against public servants or senior officers.
P. Chidambaram v. ED (2019) 9 SCC 24	Gravity is relevant but not determinative; liberty must be balanced.	Courts must assess custody necessity even in high-profile economic offences.	Strengthened proportionality analysis and rejected the argument that "seriousness of allegations" alone defeats bail.
Bikram Singh Majithia v. State of Punjab (P&H HC, 2025)	Early-stage investigation justifies stricter scrutiny.	Ongoing financial investigation and alleged influence risks warranted custody.	Illustrates that timing and stage of proceedings materially affect bail outcomes, even in the same case.
Bikram Singh Majithia v. State of Punjab (SC, 2026)	Post-chargesheet detention requires strong justification.	With investigation complete, grave allegations and prior denial of bail could not justify continued incarceration.	Reinforced that post-chargesheet custody is exceptional, marking a decisive shift toward conditional bail.

Anosh Ekka v. CBI (SC, 2026)	Length of custody and proportionality, even post-conviction.	Prolonged incarceration and overlapping proceedings outweighed gravity.	Expanded bail jurisprudence to show that delay and duration can justify bail even after conviction, pending appeal.
Devinder Kumar Bansal v. State of Punjab (SC, 2025)	Higher threshold for anticipatory bail in corruption cases.	Direct bribe demand with corroboration justified custodial interrogation.	Clarified that direct demand/receipt cases remain the hardest category for bail, especially at pre-arrest stage.
Avinash Jain v. CBI (Delhi HC, 2023)	Article 21 and default bail.	Piecemeal charge-sheets cannot defeat statutory timelines.	Confirmed that procedural lapses by the prosecution can override the gravity of PC Act allegations.

II. Consolidated Legal Impact

1. Doctrinal Shift

Courts have moved from an *offence-centric* approach to a **risk-centric analysis**, with the **Triple Test** as the controlling filter.

2. Stage Sensitivity

The same allegations can justify custody at the **investigation stage** but not **post-chargesheet**, making procedural posture decisive.

3. BNSS, 2023 Effect

Case law principles—especially from *Satender Kumar Antil*—now operate as a **statutory baseline**, encouraging courts to prefer **conditions over incarceration** wherever risks are manageable.

4. Practical Consequence

In PC Act matters, **custody risk is driven more by conduct, cooperation, and timing than by the label of "corruption" itself**.

III. The Triple Test: The Governing Bail Standard

Courts deciding bail under the PC Act uniformly apply the well-settled **"triple test"**, which constitutes the core analytical framework:

1. **Risk of Absconding (Flight Risk) –** Whether the accused is likely to evade the course of justice if released on bail.
2. **Risk of Tampering with Evidence –** Whether there exists a real and specific likelihood of the accused interfering with documentary or electronic evidence.
3. **Risk of Influencing Witnesses –** Whether the accused is likely to threaten, induce, or influence witnesses connected with the prosecution.

Importantly, courts require concrete and material-based apprehensions, not speculative or presumptive assertions. Factors such as public office, political influence, senior corporate position, or the seriousness of allegations *per se* are insufficient to satisfy the triple test. Where risks are manageable, courts consistently prefer the imposition of stringent bail conditions over continued custody.

IV. Gravity of Offence: Relevance but Not Decisiveness

While corruption offences are undoubtedly serious and implicate public trust, courts have clarified that gravity of offence cannot be the sole ground for denial of bail. The seriousness of allegations must be assessed alongside the likelihood of conviction, the nature of evidence (documentary versus testimonial), and the necessity of custodial detention. The judicial approach rejects a blanket proposition that corruption cases warrant automatic incarceration, insisting instead on a calibrated, case-specific analysis.

V. Stage of Proceedings and Custodial Justification

The procedural stage of the case plays a decisive role in bail determination:

(i) **During early investigation**, custody may be justified where custodial interrogation is demonstrably necessary, particularly in cases involving direct demand or receipt of bribes.

(ii) **Post-filing of the chargesheet**, the justification for continued incarceration weakens substantially, especially where the accused has cooperated and was not arrested during investigation.

(iii) **At the appellate stage**, prolonged custody pending appeal is subject to strict scrutiny on the touchstone of proportionality and delay.

Courts have shown an increasing willingness to grant bail or suspend sentences once the investigative purpose of arrest stands exhausted.

VI. Length of Custody and Article 21

Prolonged pre-trial detention without commensurate progress in trial has been recognized as a direct affront to Article 21. In PC Act cases involving complex financial records and multiple witnesses, trials are often protracted. Courts have therefore treated length of custody as an independent and weighty ground favouring bail, particularly where the accused has already undergone substantial incarceration without adjudication on guilt.

VII. Arrest Is Not Automatic under the PC Act

A significant doctrinal shift in corruption jurisprudence is the rejection of automatic arrest. Courts have held that arrest is not mandatory merely because an offence is cognisable or serious. Where the accused has cooperated with investigation, responded to summons, and there is no demonstrable necessity for custody, arrest—especially post-chargesheet—is viewed as unjustified. This principle has acquired statutory force under the BNSS, which mandates a necessity-based assessment of arrest.

VIII. Preference for Conditions over Incarceration

Modern PC Act bail jurisprudence reflects a regulatory approach to liberty. Courts routinely neutralize perceived risks through conditions such as surrender of passport,

travel restrictions, appearance bonds, non-contact with witnesses, and periodic reporting. This shift underscores the judicial consensus that risk management, not punishment, is the objective of bail adjudication.

IX. Consolidated Legal Position

The governing legal standard for bail under the PC Act may be summarized thus:

i. The **triple test** is mandatory and decisive.

ii. **Gravity of offence is relevant but not conclusive**.

iii. **Post-chargesheet and prolonged custody strongly favour bail**.

iv. **Liberty-centric interpretation under BNSS, 2023 reinforces conditional release** over incarceration.

X. Key Legal Proposition

Even in matters arising under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, bail must be decided on the settled parameters of the triple test—flight risk, tampering of evidence, and influence over witnesses—and in the absence of specific material satisfying these tests, continued incarceration is unconstitutional, disproportionate, and contrary to the liberty-oriented framework reinforced under the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Concluding Remarks

Bail jurisprudence under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 has undergone a marked constitutional recalibration. Once coloured by an instinctive suspicion against accused public servants, the judicial approach now resolutely affirms that allegations of corruption, however serious, do not dilute the presumption of innocence or eclipse the guarantee of personal liberty under Article 21. The consistent application of the triple test—risk of flight, tampering with evidence, and influence over witnesses—has replaced offence-centric reasoning with a risk-based, evidence-backed analysis.

The courts' evolving sensitivity to the stage of proceedings is particularly significant. While limited custodial intervention may be justified during the nascent phase of

investigation in demonstrable cases of necessity, continued incarceration post–chargesheet or during prolonged trial increasingly attracts constitutional scrutiny. The enactment of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has further fortified this liberty-oriented framework by statutorily embedding necessity and proportionality into arrest and bail decisions.

In its mature form, PC Act bail jurisprudence now reflects a conscious judicial effort to balance the imperative of combating corruption with the foundational values of due process and human dignity. The clear doctrinal message is unmistakable: corruption allegations cannot become a proxy for punishment without trial. Where risks are manageable, liberty must prevail—regulated through conditions, not negated through incarceration. This principled equilibrium ensures that the fight against corruption proceeds without sacrificing the constitutional commitment to justice, fairness, and individual freedom.

This article is for information purpose only and should not be taken as legal advice. To know further details, clarification, assistance or any advice on filing a criminal complaint or to defence against any criminal case or any legal issues on corruption financial fraud, white collar crimes or criminal laws, you may connect with us at admin@equicorplegal.com / 08448824659 and visit www.equicorplegal.com